

LOGICS

L 1	<u>Responsibility</u>
L 2	<u>Limitations</u>
L 3	<u>Intention and Counter-Intention</u>
L 4	<u>Reality and Acceptance</u>
L 5	<u>Resistance</u>
L 6	<u>Testing</u>
L 7	<u>Hostility</u>

Return to [Process Teachings](#)

THE PROCESS

CHURCH OF THE FINAL JUDGEMENT

September 1967

LOGIC ONE

Subject: RESPONSIBILITY

1. 1 Where a person has the power to choose, he has responsibility. Where he accepts his power to choose, he accepts responsibility. Where he rejects his power to choose, he accepts no responsibility.
- 2 CHOICE CAN BE BOTH CONSCIOUS AND UNCONSCIOUS
- 3 Conscious choice is where we consciously decide to do something or not to do something, and act on the decision.
- 4 Examples:
 1. You lead a blind man across the road. You have consciously chosen to help him.
 2. You slap someone's face. You have consciously chosen to hurt that person.
- 5 ACCEPTANCE OF CONSCIOUS CHOICE IS A FULL RECOGNITION THAT THE CHOICE IS ENTIRELY OURS, FREELY MADE AND FULLY INTENDED.
- 6 Rejection of conscious choice lies in attributing it to:
- 7 a) 'Ungovernable' external pressures.
Examples:
 - "What alternative did they leave me?"
 - "My duty dictated my choice."
 - "I had to stay within the law."
 - "A sense of loyalty compelled me to do it."

"Morality..."
"Common sense..."
"Convention..."
"Society..."
"The urgency of the situation..."
"Public opinion..."
"The interests of the family..."
"The boss..."
"My reputation..."
"My religion..."
"My moral obligations..."
"My principles..."
"My upbringing..."

8 There are countless elements that can seem to dictate our choice for us, and upon them we can convincingly place the responsibility for most of our conscious decisions.

9 b) 'Unavoidable' ignorance of the true state of affairs.

Examples:

"How could I have known?"
"No one told me."
"They told me such and such."
"I thought..."
"I assumed..."
"I didn't understand..."
"I didn't know..."

10 The Law makes no allowance for ignorance. It regards knowing the Law as a part of our responsibility. Yet society has made ignorance a prime and much used justification for people's failures and 'mistakes'.

11 UNCONSCIOUS CHOICE COVERS EVERYTHING THAT WE CAUSE OR HAVE THE POWER TO CAUSE WITHOUT MAKING A CONSCIOUS DECISION; EVERYTHING THAT WE CHOOSE UNCONSCIOUSLY BUT NO LESS DELIBERATELY.

12 Examples:

1. You fall downstairs. You have not chosen consciously to fall downstairs, but nevertheless you have chosen. The choice in this case is unconscious. Thus you are as responsible for your fall as if

you had said to Yourself quite consciously; "I am now going to fall downstairs", and done so. The choice is yours; no one else's.

2. You make someone very happy by something you say to them. You had not consciously intended to make them happy. Your remark, so far as you were aware, had another purpose altogether. But nevertheless, unconsciously you had chosen to make him happy and your remark was deliberately calculated to do precisely that. His choice was to be happy, yours was to be the instrument that made him so.

13 ACCEPTANCE of UNCONSCIOUS CHOICE is complete knowledge and awareness of the nature and extent of our power to choose in a situation, a total lack of the need to justify or deny that power, and complete awareness of what it is we are choosing or have already chosen in that situation.

14 REJECTION of UNCONSCIOUS CHOICE lies in:

15 a) Being unaware of the extant of our choice, and attributing circumstances which we have ourselves created to outside agents and forces that are, or seem to be, beyond our control.

16 Examples:

"He did it to me."

"They made me do it."

"He wouldn't let me do it."

"It was because of the weather."

"I couldn't help it."

"I'm not in a position to be able to do that."

"I'm not capable."

"I can't."

"It was just bad luck."

"It was just good luck."

"I couldn't stop him."

"I have no choice."

"I'm helpless."

"I didn't mean to."

"I was forced to do it."

"It's the fault of the government ... the social system ... my education ... my lack of education ... my strict upbringing ... my permissive upbringing ... the Blacks ... the Whites ... the President ... the church ... the communists ... the fascists ... the jews ... or the devil."

- 17 We are never short of this kind of justification.
- 18 b) Being oblivious of the implications and significance of the circumstances that we have unconsciously chosen to create.

19 Examples:

1. You say something that makes a friend very unhappy, by being completely unaware that you have made him unhappy, you can effectively reject your unconscious choice to do so. You can reject responsibility for what you have quite deliberately done, by being unconscious of it.

2. You have done a job very badly. It has been a complete failure. You have deliberately, though unconsciously, chosen that it SHOULD be so. But in order to avoid any sense of responsibility for having done this, you are unaware that it was a failure. You do not see it as a failure.

3. You fail an examination. Deep down, though you do not allow yourself to be conscious of this, the examination was of very great importance to you. Now you have failed quite deliberately. And, as it happens, you are willing to recognize that it was your unconscious intention to fail. But what you are not willing to recognize is the extent of the failure for you. You reduce the importance of the failure. You remain unaware of the magnitude of what you have done to yourself by failing that particular examination. In this way you evade responsibility for the full implications of your action by being unconscious of them. You knew you have chosen to fail, but refuse to know the full extent to which you have chosen to fail.

RESPONSIBILITY IS CHOICE

2. 1 ACCEPTANCE OF RESPONSIBILITY IS THE AWARENESS OF CHOICE
- 2 Acceptance of responsibility is not in taking or not taking a particular action in a particular situation, but in recognizing the true extent of choice that we

have in a situation, being aware of precisely what we are doing, have done and can do with our power of choice, and all the consequences involved. And finally acting or not acting on the basis of that recognition and awareness.

- 3 TO BE AWARE IS TO BE RESPONSIBLE, AS LONG AS WE ACCEPT OUR AWARENESS AS A VALID STANDPOINT AND BASIS FOR OUR ACTIONS AND DECISIONS.
- 4 We cannot judge a person's level of responsibility by what he does or does not do, except inasmuch as it reflects the extent of his awareness. For it is his awareness of the implications, the significance and the consequences of what he is doing or not doing that defines his level of responsibility, and not the rightness or wrongness, according to our values, of his action.
- 5 And we will be easily deceived by ourselves if we ASSUME that a person is unaware and therefore irresponsible, simply because he is doing something that we consider wrong and would choose not to do, or that he is aware and therefore responsible because he does things that we consider to be right and would choose to do ourselves. This is compulsive identification and is a totally unreliable form of assessment.
- 6 NO ACTION OR NON ACTION, HOWEVER APPARENTLY MORAL, CONSTRUCTIVE, ETHICAL, CONSIDERATE, HUMANITARIAN, RELIGIOUS, SOCIABLE, HEROIC OR PROGRESSIVE IS NECESSARILY RESPONSIBLE.
- 7 It does not necessarily stem from a standpoint of acceptance or responsibility, because it does not necessarily stem from awareness.
- 8 Similarly:

NO ACTION OR NON ACTION, HOWEVER APPARENTLY IMMORAL, DESTRUCTIVE, UNETHICAL, INCONSIDERATE, ANTI-HUMANITARIAN, IRRELIGIOUS, ANTISOCIAL, COWARDLY OR RETROGRESSIVE IS NECESSARILY IRRESPONSIBLE.
- 9 It does not necessarily stem from a rejection of responsibility, because it does not necessarily stem from unawareness.
- 10 The only true criterion is our awareness and our attitude to our awareness.
- 11 If a person is unaware of what he is doing, the consequences of what he is doing, the nature of the effects he is creating and the motives behind his actions, then he is rejecting his power of choice, and thus his responsibility.

- 12 If a person is aware of these things and discounts his awareness, invalidates it to himself, and puts a lie in it's place, he still rejects responsibility.
- 13 If however he is aware, knows precisely what he is doing, it's implications, significance, and consequences; sees clearly the nature of the effects he is creating, and is totally open with himself about the true motives behind his actions, this then is a truly responsible person.
- 14 Examples:
1. You are given some important information and asked not to divulge it to anyone. You tell a friend, and as a result someone else loses his job, at which you are utterly amazed and extremely upset. Your reaction is: "Well, how was I to know? I thought. . . You see. . . ', and so on. Now your irresponsibility in this situation is not the divulging of the secret. It is not in doing something you were asked not to do. Nor is it in causing someone to lose his job. No action, however apparently 'wrong-, is necessarily irresponsible. No, your rejection of responsibility is - in unawareness of the consequences of your actions, or the possible consequences of them. You were not even taking a calculated risk, and - in your ignorance of the fact that if your action caused someone to lose his job then you deliberately chose that this should happen.
 2. You bewail your financial difficulties and blame the government for over taxing you. And your employer for underpaying you. You are convinced that you are the victim of exploitation and mismanagement. So you 'strike' ' and because several million others with roughly similar attitudes to yours 'strike' also. Your country's economy is hurt. You suffer a worse deprivation than ever, continue to bewail your lot, blaming now not only the government and your employer, but the entire system. Now again your irresponsibility is not in 'striking', nor is it in contributing to a national crisis. These actions could stem from perfectly responsible attitudes. Your irresponsibility is your unawareness a) of the probable consequences of your actions both to yourself and nationally, b) of your own deliberate intention to play a part in bringing about these consequences, and c) of the extent of choice you have in your own circumstances, i.e. that if you are unable to make ends meet, it's because you choose to be that way. Maybe it is an inadequate system, but you choose to be at the painful end of it. Maybe there is mismanagement but you choose to lose by it. Maybe there is exploitation, but you choose to put yourself in an exploitable position. There is nothing irresponsible about choosing any of these things, the

irresponsibility lies to the fact that you are unaware that you have deliberately chosen them.

RESPONSIBILITY IS CHOICE

3. 1 IT IS OUR CHOICE TO FAIL. IT IS EQUALLY OUR CHOICE TO SUCCEED.
- 2 We do not reject responsibility only for our failures and inadequacies, although this is the most common area. We also reject it for our successes and our good qualities. We 'disown' our successes in much the same way that we 'disown' our failures. Either we remain unaware of them by now seeing the implications and significance of our actions, or if we cannot fail to see them, we attribute them to circumstances beyond our control.
- 3 Examples:
 1. You are promoted in your job. Instead of recognizing that this is your own deliberate choice, you attribute it to sheer good luck. By so doing you accept no responsibility for causing your own promotion.
 2. You go to a meeting and during it you provide intense stimulation for all those present, so that they leave enriched by the experience. However, you are completely unaware of the effect that you have created; and when complimented on the fact that you 'made' the evening for everybody, you 'modestly' brush the compliment aside and deny having done any such thing. First of all you reject responsibility for the effect you have created, by being oblivious of it. Secondly, when faced with the effect, you reject the responsibility of having created it.
- 4 MODESTY IS A FORM OF IRRESPONSIBILITY. IT REFLECTS A STATE OF UNAWARENESS OR NON ACCEPTANCE OF A QUALITY OR ACHIEVEMENT IN SELF
- 5 Now it is not hard to understand why we reject responsibility for our failures and inadequacies, either by being unaware of them or by justifying them. We feel that they reduce our stature, and we do not like our stature reduced. We do not like to feel inadequate. We do not like to have a sense of failure. But why then do we bring failure upon ourselves? Why do we choose to be inadequate? For the same reason that we justify or remain oblivious of our successes and our superior qualities.

- 6 If all we wanted was success and adequacy, than all we would have would be success and adequacy. All we would choose would be success and adequacy. Also, we would never need to shut our eyes to our successes or shift responsibility for them. We would not need to attribute our achievements to other people. We would give credit and gratitude where they are due. But we would not disown our own personal choice to succeed.
- 7 So why, as well as being shy of failure, are we also shy of success?
- 8 Because although we do not want too small a stature, we do not want to feel inferior. We do not want to be burdened by a permanent sense of failure and inadequacy. On the other hand; nor do we want too great a stature, for fear of what might be expected and demanded of us, both by ourselves and by other people.
- 9 If we show brilliance, than brilliant achievements will be expected and demanded of us. If we are aware of our brilliance, then we shall feel obligated to realize it; to make use of it. We shall demand brilliant achievements of ourselves. The same if we show our ability to help people and recognize that ability ourselves. Everyone, ourselves included, will expect us to make full use of it.
- 10 So the effect of displaying our qualities, both to ourselves and to other people is to enlarge our area of 'known' responsibility. To make us aware of a wider scope of choice than we want to know about. To show us the extent of our power to choose. Nothing can change the ACTUAL extent of our power to choose, the ACTUAL scope of our responsibility. But success can extend our AWARENESS of this scope. Where before we consciously felt no obligation, no need for fulfillment in a particular direction; and therefore no conscious burden of responsibility in that direction. Now that obligation appears, and we realize that there are moves we have to make, tasks we have to undertake, functions we have to perform, responsibilities we have to take upon ourselves which before we had effectively hidden behind the curtain of our own awareness.
- 11 Blindness achieves nothing ultimately, but we have convinced ourselves of its effectiveness. We have persuaded ourselves that what we cannot see is not there. What we do not know about does not exist. Therefore we have an unconscious agreement that the scope of our responsibility is equal to the extent of our awareness of the scope of our responsibility. Therefore we feel that by expanding or contracting our awareness, we expand or contract our power of choice. Not so. The extent of the power of choice, the scope of our responsibility does not change. Only our awareness of it changes as we choose to see more or less of the true and complete picture. And the size of

the gap between our vision of the scope of our responsibility and the true scope, is the extent of the lie by which we live.

- 12 But why do we wish to reduce the scope of our responsibility, and thus attempt to do so by reducing our awareness of it?
- 13 Because, again, we are afraid of failure. We are afraid of the demands that might be made upon us, because we might prove inadequate to meet those demands. We are afraid to expect things of ourselves, because we might let ourselves down.
- 14 WE WANT OUR STANDARDS LOW, SO THAT WE CAN MEET THEM AND THEREFORE NOT FEEL INADEQUATE.
- 15 Either way, the enemy is ultimately a sense of failure. A feeling of inadequacy and inferiority, of dissatisfaction with self; of lack of fulfillment. If we fail according to our standards, and are aware that we have failed, then the feeling is with us, the enemy has a victory. If we succeed beyond our standards, or achieve something outside the limits we have set ourselves, and are aware of our success or our new found capability, then we are forced to raise our standards. Or extend the limits of our expectation of ourselves; and thus we become just that much more susceptible to a sense of failure. Just that much more vulnerable to the enemy.
- 16 Example:

You sit for a scholarship, because you are considered academically clever enough to have a fair chance of winning it. No one demands that you win the scholarship; you have not shown abilities that would lead people to take it for granted that you will. Nor do you demand it of yourself. No one will blame you if you fail, nor look down on you. And you will not blame yourself. You might feel some disappointment, but you will not feel that you have had a dismal failure. If you should win the scholarship on the other hand, everyone's assessment of your academic ability will go up, including your own. A possibility will have become a certainty. Consequently from that moment on, much more will be expected of you than was before. Your future academic career will be predicted on a very high level. You will be expected to progress much faster than other students of your age who have not won scholarships. Your success will not only be expected but assumed, taken completely for granted. If you do not emerge with honors and prizes, everyone, yourself included will feel extremely let down. You could be accused of laziness and irresponsibility. Whereas, if you fail the exam, nothing more than a slightly better than

moderate performance will be expected of you. If you should win a prize you will feel a great sense of achievement and you will be praised - and it can always be attributed to excessively hard work, as opposed to too much brilliance - and if you should not win a prize, no one, not even yourself, will be disappointed in you.

Faced with sitting for the scholarship that would probably not be your conscious assessment of the situation. But it would most certainly be your unconscious assessment of it. And unconsciously it is quite likely that you would decide to fail the exam. And your decision, on the basis of the above argument, would be a perfectly logical one. And if you unconsciously decide to fail, whatever your conscious attitude might be, you would fail. And that would be your choice.

RESPONSIBILITY IS CHOICE

4. 1 THE SCOPE OF A PERSON'S RESPONSIBILITY IS THE EXTENT OF HIS POWER OF CHOICE.
- 2 The scope of his awareness of his responsibility is the extent to which he recognizes his power of choice.
- 3 The scope of a person's responsibility includes everything - people, groups of people, situations, circumstances, objects, groups of objects, environments and events - past, present and future; upon which he has the power to create an effect, should he choose or had he chosen to do so. It also includes every effect which he has or has had the power to create, and every action which he has or has had the power to take.
- 4 We have the power to create effects upon everything with which we have or could have any kind of contact, direct or indirect.
- 5 The nature and the extent of the effect which we have the power to create on something depends upon the nature and the extent of the contact which it is within our power to have with that thing.
- 6 Therefore everything with which we have or could have any kind of contact, direct or indirect, comes within the scope of our responsibility.
- 7 Examples:

1. You have a friend and you have the power to create effects upon him through your contact with him. He comes within the scope of your responsibility.

2. You are a newspaper columnist, therefore you have the power to create effects on the readers of your newspaper. They come within the scope of your responsibility.

3. You are invited to a party. You can go or not as you choose. You have the power to create an effect on the party and the other people at the party, because you have the power to make contact with them if you choose to go. Consequently the party comes within the scope of your responsibility.

4. As an employer, as well as having a direct contact with your employees, which brings them within the scope of your responsibility, you also have an indirect contact, through them, with their wives and families, and even their friends and neighbor, which gives you the power to create effects upon all these people, and therefore brings them also into the scope of your responsibility.

8 Whoever we are, whatever may be our position in the world, we have the power to make some kind of contact, direct or indirect, with people and situations and objects. Even the knowledge or the awareness of the existence of something or someone gives us the power to make contact of some kind or another and therefore to create an effect.

9 But remember also that the scope of our responsibility is defined, not only by whom or by what we have the power to effect, in other words, the purely physical extent of our power of choice, but even more significantly, by the nature and the extent of the effects which we have the power to create upon those things and people. And this of course depends upon the nature and extent of our contact or potential contact with them.

10 Example:

The effects which a man has the power to create upon his wife are much stronger, more complex, and more far reaching than those which he can choose to create on an acquaintance, whom he has the opportunity of meeting once and year.

Similarly the effects he can create on his own home environment, are far greater and more numerous than those he can choose to create on someone else's.

- 11 THE INDIVIDUAL HAS THE POWER AND THE CHOICE TO HAVE PERMANENT
DIRECT AND COMPLETE CONTACT WITH HIMSELF.
- 12 Therefore he and everything about him is permanently within the scope of his
responsibility, and the extent of the effects an individual has the power to
create upon himself, whether consciously or unconsciously, is limitless.
- 13 Whatever we are or are not, whatever we do or do not do, whatever happens
to us or does not happen to us, whatever we think, feel, know, see or sense in
any way, whatever we experience or do not experience, all these effects upon
ourselves we have or have had the power to create or not create. Therefore
all of these effects or non-effects we ourselves have chosen, consciously or
unconsciously. Everything that happens to us, we have chosen should
happen to us. Everything that we do we have chosen to do. Everything that
we think and feel, we have chosen to think and feel. Everything that we
experience we have chosen to experience.
- 14 Examples:
1. If you are unhappy, it is because you choose to be unhappy.
Certainly, you may use someone else to help you to bring about the
state, but whatever the effect he has on you, it is your choice that he
should have such an effect. His choice is to be used by you to create
your state or unhappiness.
 2. If you are ill, it is because you choose to be ill. Of course there
is a germ or virus or some other organic agent that produced the
illness. Your choice is to become subject to the agent, to use it to
bring about your illness.
- 15 If a man consciously chooses to shoot himself with a gun, no one suggests
that the gun is to blame for his death, and that the man had no power over
the gun's decision to kill him. However, if a man unconsciously chooses to
lay himself low with cancer, then no one questions the assumption that the
man had no choice in the matter, that cancer was responsible for his
condition and he the unfortunate victim.

RESPONSIBILITY IS CHOICE

5. 1 Choice is the power to choose.

- 2 Whatever the full extent of our fundamental power to choose, there is no doubt that we have severely limited it superficially. For instance I can say: "It is not within my power to fly, therefore it is not my choice that I do not fly." But that is no different from cutting off my hands and then saying: "It is not within my power to pick up things, therefore it is not my choice that I do not do so."
- 3 Basically, we are not human beings: we are universal beings, free souls journeying through time. And we have chosen to be human as part of our journey. We have taken on the limitations of a human existence and therefore become subject to its laws. We have chosen for a period to limit the extent of our choice. But even within the narrow confines of this human existence we still choose to limit ourselves even further; some of us more than others. We give ourselves incapacities, inadequacies, ignorance and blindness. We deliberately reduce the immediate extent of our choice, and therefore within the scope of our responsibility.
- 4 So let us be quite clear that everything that happens to us, is, on some level or other, our choice, our decision, and therefore our responsibility.
- 5 But, you may protest, "If someone throws a stone at me, how can that be my choice? Surely it is his choice".
- 6 Quite correct. If someone throws a stone at you that is his choice. But if you are hit by a stone, that is your choice. His choice is to throw it; yours is to be hit by it. Your choice is to be afraid or unafraid, injured or unharmed. You might even be killed if that is your intention. Also, you have already chosen to put yourself in a position so that this whole situation can arise. You have chosen to be here. You have chosen to have no protection from the man throwing the stone. You may even have provoked him.
- 7 Your choice is what happens to you and your relationship to what happens to him.
- 8 If you hurt someone it is his choice to be hurt, it is your choice to do the hurting. What happens to him is his choice; your relationship to what happens to him is your choice. The part that you play in what happens to him, the effect that it has on you, your response to it, the fact that you are creating a specific effect on him, all these elements are your choice and therefore come within the scope of your responsibility.

6. 1 But whose choice, for instance, is a failed marriage? The wife's or the husband's?
- 2 It is a mutual choice, the choice of both of them. Both, consciously or unconsciously, want and have chosen a failed marriage.
- 3 But what if the husband wants a successful marriage and the wife a failed one?
- 4 Then the two do not marry one another. Even though we very rarely know and even more rarely openly state our unconscious intentions, we project them strongly. It is in fact on the wavelength of these unconscious projections that we really communicate with one another. Thus two people who unconsciously desire a failed marriage are drawn together on the basis of this mutual wish. Though of course they will find countless conscious rationalisations for their attraction to one another, the real links will be such as this shared desire for a failed relationship. They are sending out powerful signals all the time on this level, and each responds equally unconsciously, to the other's signals. And it is on this basis, the basis of true intention, not conscious protest or outward appearance, that such attachments are formed.
- 5 The situation is complicated by countless other unconscious desires of varying intensity and importance on both sides, and consequently the final decision to marry is only made and implemented on the basis of an overall mutual conclusion that a situation that will 'satisfy' both partners can be created.
- 6 And, depending on the nature of a person's unconscious needs, such 'satisfaction' could well constitute sheer hell. Whatever their conscious protests, many people unconsciously seek only suffering. That is their choice, so that is their fate. Consequently they will look for partners who they can be sure will give it to them, partners who project the message that giving people hell 'satisfies' THEIR unconscious needs.
- 7 But if to begin with, both husband and wife want a failed marriage, and then when they have one, one of them changes, What then?
- 8 Either the one who has chosen to change helps to bring about a change in the other which of course depends upon the CHOICE of the other, whether or not to change also or they will separate, because a relationship together no longer satisfied both their needs. Then each would find his or her wish elsewhere. The one who had changed would either find a successful relationship or would remain isolated, depending on the nature of the

change. Meanwhile the other would most likely find another relationship in which to create and be subject to the still required failure.

- 9 Why should anyone want a failed marriage anyway?
- 10 As a limitation; in order to be able to say to him or herself; If only my marriage were not in such a poor state I could do so and so, be so and so, have so and so. It helps a person to put a 'justifiable distance' between himself and his expectations of himself. If for instance a man has (in his terms and remember such terms as 'success' and 'failure' are totally relative) a successful marriage, he then has no excuse, no justification that will persuade him that it is not his fault, and therefore no reduction of him, that he falls short of his demands upon himself. In this case he will, if he needs such a justification, have to create for himself another limitation, another justifiable handicap on which to pin the responsibility for his inadequacies.
- 11 If the nature of the relationship between two people is the choice of both of them, how can each person take COMPLETE responsibility for it?
- 12 Because responsibility is not a divisible item. Choice is personal, individual and total, and so is responsibility. A relationship has two altogether separate aspects, each representing a complete decision and a complete choice on its own. There is on one side, everything that happens to one of the partners in the relationship, everything he does, does not do, says, does not say, feels, does not feel, thinks, does not think, has, does not have, experiences, does not experience, etc. On the other side there is everything that happens to the other partner.
- 13 ACCEPTING RESPONSIBILITY IS NOT A MATTER OF APPORTIONING BLAME OR CREDIT. IT IS A MATTER OF RECOGNISING CHOICE.
- 14 It would be a worthless and meaningless activity to divide the responsibility for X's and Y's relationship BETWEEN X and Y. To say that that particular failure is X's fault, whereas the credit for such and such a success should go to Y, although of course Y is also primarily to blame for that disaster, and so on. This achieves nothing. The only valid activity with regard to responsibility in a relationship is that each partner should recognise and accept the full extent of his or her choice in the relationship. Bearing in mind that the fact (say) that X is unhappy about Y, involves two completely distinct choices. Y chooses to make X unhappy and X chooses to be unhappy because of Y. By all means X may recognise Y's choice in the situation, but if he uses it to negate, or justify his own choice, then he is accepting no responsibility. Acceptance of responsibility is a matter of being aware of the

full extent and nature of our own choice and our own power to choose in a situation, and not of stressing someone else's.

15 Example:

You have a quarrel with your friend. You feel bad about it, and you say to yourself; "He's so stubborn. He doesn't know what he's talking about, but he goes on insisting he's right. All I want to do is get my point across to him. I don't want to have an argument, but he refuses to listen, so I can't help getting angry. Now he won't speak to me at all. What can I do?

This attitude is simply pinning labels on an emotional reaction that stems directly from a sense of failure. The sense of failure is fine. Your choice. The emotional reaction is fine. Again your choice. But the labels are nothing; meaningless lies, a charade, a total rejection of responsibility. The truth is that you have chosen to alienate your friend and you have chosen to feel bad as a result. Also it is within your power to effect a reconciliation or not as you choose. Effecting a reconciliation would not necessarily be a responsible action. Nor would choosing to continue the quarrel necessarily be an irresponsible action. The criterion as always is the extent of awareness of the situation, and of your choice in it, the motives and implications behind your choice and of the possible consequences of your choice. If you act from a standpoint of awareness, then whatever action you take is a responsible one. If you act from blindness and self-deception then equally whatever action you take is irresponsible.

RESPONSIBILITY IS CHOICE

7. 1 EVERYONE IS UNCONSCIOUSLY AWARE OF THE TRUE EXTENT OF HIS OWN CHOICE, AND THEREFORE OF THE NATURE AND SCOPE OF HIS RESPONSIBILITY.
- 2 A RESPONSIBLE PERSON IS ONE WHO ALLOWS HIMSELF TO BE CONSCIOUSLY AWARE OF THE EXTENT OF HIS OWN POWER TO CHOOSE AND ACCEPTS IT.
- 3 AN IRRESPONSIBLE PERSON IS ONE WHO EITHER DOES NOT ALLOW HIMSELF TO BE AWARE OF THE FULL EXTENT OF HIS OWN POWER TO

CHOOSE, OR WHERE HE CANNOT FAIL TO BE AWARE OF IT, DENIES IT AND
REJECTS THE AWARENESS.

- 4 A responsible person, by his very awareness, is outside the conflict between compulsively taking responsibility and compulsively rejecting responsibility.
- 5 An irresponsible person, through his unawareness, through his unwillingness to see either the extent of his power to choose or precisely what he has chosen or is choosing, is caught between rejecting responsibility that is his, and demanding responsibility that is not his. He alternates between compulsive responsibility and compulsive non-responsibility. Neither is acceptance of responsibility, because both stem from a standpoint of unawareness of the true state of affairs.
- 6 Example:

You have a quarrel with your friend. You feel desperately guilty, blame yourself for the entire situation, insist that it was none of your friend's fault and punish yourself with a bout of excessive remorse. Also you convince your friend completely, that you have done the unforgiveable and nothing will ever be the same again.
- 7 This is an example of both compulsive demand for and compulsive rejection of responsibility. By blaming yourself, by insisting that you take responsibility for your friend's choice as well as your own, and also by persuading yourself that you have caused effects which you have not in fact caused at all, you are demanding responsibility for things for which you are not responsible. On the other hand by protesting that the situation is beyond recall, in other words that there is nothing either you or anyone else can do to change it for the better, you are rejecting the fact that if you choose to do so, you yourself can improve the situation both from your personal point of view and from the point of view of your relationship with your friend.
- 8 You are rejecting your power of choice and therefore your responsibility.

RESPONSIBILITY IS CHOICE

- 18 LEVELS TWO AND THREE ARE TWO ASPECTS OF ONE LEVEL. THEY
CONSTITUTE THE HUMAN GAME, THE CONFLICT BETWEEN SELF-BLAME
AND SELF-JUSTIFICATION, COMPULSIVE RESPONSIBILITY AND
COMPULSIVE NON-RESPONSIBILITY.
- 19 They are two sides of the same coin; Irresponsibility. Humanity is caught
between them, oscillating from one to the other, blindly struggling sometimes
to justify itself and sometimes to expiate for its inadequacies, and often trying
to combine the two. At one moment a person will bewail the fate of the
victims, insist that they have no choice and heap responsibility for their state
upon his own head. In the next breath he will very convincingly shift all
responsibility onto a small group of materially powerful men, whom he and
his fellow human beings have chosen to lead and control them. Either way,
people on these two levels, continually pin the wrong labels onto their
reactions and emotions, because they have chosen to be unaware of the true
scope and nature of their responsibility.
- 20 And they move between the levels in a cycle. They have a conflict: to
demand responsibility or to reject responsibility. Although a person may be
enacting one level, he is by no means free of the other side of the conflict.
The human conflict between self-blame and expiation on one hand and self-
justification and the evasion of consequences on the other is the level on
which most of humanity plays its game, and an agonising game it is.
- 21 LEVEL FOUR: OBLIVIOUSNESS IS THE MAJOR CHARACTERISTIC
ON THIS LEVEL. OBLIVIOUSNESS OF THE WHOLE
CONCEPT OF RESPONSIBILITY.
- 22 LEVEL FOUR IS BELOW AND OUTSIDE THE CONFLICT OF LEVELS TWO AND
THREE. A PERSON IS ON THIS LEVEL WHEN THE WHOLE CONCEPT OF
RESPONSIBILITY IS TOTALLY UNREAL TO HIM.
- 23 He does not feel the need either to expiate or justify. Guilt is meaningless
to him. He feels, but not in terms of right or wrong, responsibility or non-
responsibility, success or failure. He simply is what he is, does what he feels
like doing and remains oblivious of the tortuous game that is being played
out around choice and no choice.
- 24 This level has strong similarities with Level One on all appearances. Amoral
people, for instance are to be found on both levels. But the vital difference is
the level of awareness. Level Four is a level of great limitation, because
where there is blindness there is little freedom. The BASIC extent of the
power to choose is unchanged, but the immediate and apparent extent of it is

heavily reduced. If a man has his leg amputated he does not alter one whit the overall scope of his responsibility but he drastically reduces his CURRENT scope; like a man who owns an enormous house, but locks himself into one room and throws the key out of the window.

- 25 The person on Level Four has reduced his awareness of the scope of his responsibility so completely that the whole concept of responsibility has become meaningless to him, whereas the person on Level One has increased his awareness to such an extent, that he has risen above the conflict between demanding responsibility that isn't there and discarding responsibility that IS there, and reached a plateau of detachment from all compulsive activity in that area.
- 26 THE MAJORITY OF PEOPLE ARE ON LEVELS TWO AND THREE.
CONFLICTED ON ONE SIDE THEY WANT TO TAKE MORE AND MORE
RESPONSIBILITY ONTO THEIR SHOULDERS, INCREASE THE EXTENT OF
THEIR POWER TO CHOOSE, AND ON THE OTHER SIDE THEY WANT TO
SHIFT RESPONSIBILITY, JUSTIFY THEMSELVES AND LAY CLAIM TO THE
MINIMUM AMOUNT OF CHOICE OVER THEIR CIRCUMSTANCES. AS A
RESULT THEY GO AROUND IN AN ENDLESS CIRCLE, ALTERNATELY TRYING
TO EXPAND AND CONTRACT THE SCOPE OF THEIR RESPONSIBILITY, BUT
IN FACT CHANGING NOTHING BUT THE NATURE OF THEIR OWN ILLUSIONS
ABOUT THEMSELVES.
- 27 Often they stagnate in the centre of the conflict, fix on a pattern for themselves which gives them a scope of responsibility into which they can fit themselves without any great intensity either of demanding or discarding responsibility, and then close down on all emotions that might drive them one way or the other. To do this they must suppress all their natural instincts, and live in a self created vacuum shut off from themselves as they really are. Then they can behave according to a set of rules imposed from without instead of dictated from within, and although responsibility is real and meaningful for them, it is in terms of an external convenient code, instead of the painful demands of an internal conflict.

As it is, so be it.

[Signature -- Robert]

September 1967

ROBERT DE GRIMSTON

THIS MATERIAL IS THE PROPERTY OF THE PROCESS

Return to [Logics](#)

Return to [Process Teachings](#)

THE PROCESS

CHURCH OF THE FINAL JUDGEMENT

1965

revised May 1968

LOGIC TWO

Subject: LIMITATIONS

1. 1 WHEN A PERSON'S SCOPE OF KNOWLEDGE, ABILITY, AWARENESS,
CONTROL OR SENSITIVITY THREATENS TO BECOME TOO LARGE FOR HIM HE
CREATES LIMITATIONS FOR HIMSELF IN ORDER TO RESTRICT IT.
- 2 TOO MUCH SCOPE IN ANY OF THESE DIRECTIONS CARRIES WITH IT TOO MUCH
CONSCIOUS AWARENESS OF RESPONSIBILITY.
- 3 By limiting the scope of our knowledge, ability, etc., we limit the
scope of our responsibility - or at least the scope of our AWARENESS of our
responsibility. We no longer see the full extent of our true function and
purpose in life. We see no further than the bounds of our Limitations.
- 4 SO A LIMITATION IN ORDER TO BE EFFECTIVE MUST BE AT THE SAME TIME
A JUSTIFICATION, OTHERWISE THERE IS NO ESCAPE FROM A CONSCIOUS
AWARENESS OF RESPONSIBILITY BEYOND THE LIMITATION.
- 5 A Limitation must appear as basically one of two things: -
- 6 a) An infliction, 'just one of those things', an inavoidable
obstacle, a fact of life, something over which we have no control, such as:
failures, losses, burdens, incapacabilities; inadequacies, disasters; or
stupidity, ignorance, unawareness, insensitivity, repression, fear, insanity,
sickness and infirmity.
- 7 It is possible for us to deliberately, though quite unconsciously,
bring about such things for and in ourselves, and yet to remain

consciously convinced that it is through no choice of our own that they occur.

8 Examples:

1. A man does well in his job and is promised that if he continues to do as well he will be promoted to a higher position. Almost at once his work falls off. He makes mistakes, becomes forgetful and generally makes it quite clear he's not fit for promotion. He is not conscious of deliberately regressing, and may be as surprised as everyone else at his failures, but unconsciously he does not want the increased feelings of responsibility in the new position, so he reduces his capabilities accordingly.

2. A man builds up a business to a certain point, and then suddenly some 'misfortune' befalls it and he finds he is back where he started. The scope of responsibility involved in the expansion threatened to become too great for him, so he had to reduce it drastically by a financial collapse. Of course, it appears to be sheer bad luck, so as to prevent him being conscious of having deliberately engineered it. Sometimes, after such a disaster, you hear a person saying, 'I can't think what came over me. Normally, I'd never have done that'. Or, putting the blame on someone else, 'I knew it was the wrong move, but he was so insistent...' Or, 'I've never forgotten to do such and such before. This had to be the one day I forgot it.' Indications that on some level he KNOWS that he has deliberately caused the incident, or at least deliberately failed to prevent it.

9 b) A moral restriction, an obligation, a commitment, a code of ethics, a religious dogma, something which reduces the scope of our thoughts, emotions, actions and abilities, by convincing us that there are certain things we should or should not do, be, feel, think, experience, etc.

10 These two we can create deliberately and specifically in order to limit our scope, and yet at the same time be utterly convinced that they are genuinely altruistic and selfless moral, social or spiritual values.

11 Example:

A woman wants to marry but cannot because she feels obliged to look after her ailing mother. Clearly marriage carries with it

greater scope both for fulfillment and for failure, than looking after an ailing mother. So the sense of obligation is used as a limitation against the responsibility of a marriage relationship.

- 12 LIMITATIONS CAN BE 'BASIC' OR 'CURRENT'
- 13 Long standing physical disabilities, deep-rooted moral and religious codes, stupidity, neuroses and phobias, these are all 'basic' Limitations. They are part of a person's basic pattern of unconscious 'agreements'. They are there as a PERMANENT boundary to the person's scope, a constant and built-in barrier to maintain his chronic level of awareness of responsibility, and they can only be removed by taking the person back to the original compulsive 'agreement' from which they stem. Then they will disintegrate because the force holding them in place will have gone.
- 14 'Current' Limitations on the other hand, are physical or mental conditions brought in to handle specific situations.
- 15 The first two examples above are instances of 'current' Limitations. The man's incapability is not basic, as shown by his previous efficiency. A business collapse is a 'current' incident, not a 'basic' characteristic, and is therefore a 'current' Limitation. The third example, the woman and her ailing mother, comprises both a 'current' and a 'basic' Limitation and illustrates how the two are often combined to produce an effective result. The 'ailing mother' is an external circumstance and therefore 'current', but the sense of obligation is a 'basic' moral attitude. Each on its own need create no Limitation, but together they create a very effective one.
- 16 The following examples are instances of 'basic' Limitations.
 1. A man is impotent and consequently every relationship he has with a woman is sexually a failure. As a result he cannot have a complete and lasting relationship. He is using impotence to prevent himself from really becoming involved and taking all the responsibility that this would bring with it. Only by getting at the root of his need to be uninvolved in this way would it be possible for him to get rid of his impotence.
 2. A boy is stupid at school, and as a result very little is expected of him in the way of academic achievement. He is using stupidity to avoid the responsibility that a clever boy has, to do what is inevitably expected of him

by both his parents and his teachers, to pass exams and win scholarships, and then to continue in the kind of pattern that these achievements impose on him.

3. A man is heavily repressed emotionally. He has great difficulty in responding or reacting to things. Consequently he is not a threat to anyone. He is utterly predictable, apparently completely stable and imperturbable. Nothing seems to throw him off balance. He is using repression to prevent himself from enacting and expressing strong emotions that might have far reaching consequences for which he will have to take responsibility. Such a person will never APPARENTLY cause any positively destructive effects, but nor will he be in any way constructive. He has 'limited' himself to a point of negativity.
4. A woman has a deep-rooted moral 'agreement' with herself that it is wrong to get angry with people. Her imposed rule, that she avoids doing it at all costs. As a result, she avoids the possible repercussions of expression of her anger. Sometimes a moral agreement is so powerful that it generates not only a deterrent of guilt, but an actual incapability to perform the 'immoral' act; an even more effective 'basic' Limitation.
- 17 ANY 'CURRENT' LIMITATION, IF USED CONSTANTLY, CAN BECOME SO FIRMLY INGRAINED AS TO CONSTITUTE A 'BASIC' LIMITATION.
- 18 Religious or ideological dogma, as it stands, often constitutes a useable 'current Limitation, but a person CAN become so irrevocably indoctrinated with such dogma that it becomes 'basic'.
- 19 Certain physical ailments, originally 'produced' as Limitations for specific situations ('current'), if used frequently can become chronic ('basic').

As it is, so be it.

THIS MATERIAL IS THE PROPERTY OF THE PROCESS

Return to [Logics](#)

Return to [Process Teachings](#)

LOGIC THREE

Subject: INTENTION AND COUNTER-INTENTION

1. 1 ANY COMPULSIVE NEED, WHETHER IT IS A BASIC COMPULSION OR SIMPLY A MECHANISM CAN BE REFERRED TO AS AN UNCONSCIOUS INTENTION.
- 2 When we speak of Intention and Counter-intention, the term 'Intention' refers to a particular compulsive need which has conscious manifestations, in the form of strong desires, feelings of obligations, ethical and conscientious considerations, logical arguments or justifications, i.e. the compulsive need that manifests is a CONSCIOUS wish or preference. 'Counter-intention' is the term applied to the compulsive need that the conscious wish (the Intention) is directed against, where any conscious manifestations in the form of thoughts or feelings to support it, are ' outweighed by opposing thoughts or feelings in favour of the Intention.
- 3 Examples:
 1. Some one with a strong desire to make money can be said to have an Intention to make money - this would be a mechanism on a basic compulsion - and the Intention is supported by a conscious emotion directing him towards 'that end' a mechanism on a mechanism if you like. On the other hand the Counter-intention which-is concerned with NOT making money - a mechanism on the other side of the basic conflict - has no such manifestation. There might be a mild ethical consideration creeping in that whispers "filthy lucre" but it is far outweighed on the conscious level.
 2. Another person has intense feelings of obligation and 'responsibility' towards his fellow man; he feels consciously that he must help and contribute and spread a lot of sweetness and light around him. This indicates an Intention in that direction. also indicates a Counter-intention which is concerned with destroying people and bringing them down, although this has no such conscious manifestations. Any feelings of dislike or resentment towards people that arise are quickly suppressed and overlaid by an intensification of the protests of goodwill and loving kindness.
- 4 THE INTENTION IS WHAT WE SAY WE WANT, WHAT WE THINK WE WANT, WHAT WE FEEL WE WANT, WHAT WE WANT TO WANT, AND WHAT WE TAKE PAINS TO CONVINCE OURSELVES AND EVERYONE ELSE THAT WE DO WANT. THE COUNTER-INTENTION IS WHAT WE CONSCIOUSLY RESIST, DENY, AVOID AND FIGHT AGAINST.
- 5 This is because THE COUNTER-INTENTION IS BASICALLY THE STRONGER OF THE TWO COMPULSIONS.
- 6 Our conscious 'performance' around the Intention side of the conflict is the chief indication of the strength of the Counter-intention that opposes it.
- 7 The more intensely we feel or think CONSCIOUSLY that we want something, the more sure we can be that we want the very opposite more strongly on an UNCONSCIOUS level. It's like taking someone's temperature. Supposing it is high; the reason for this is to help the person to counteract a physical

debility. He's not ill BECAUSE he has a high temperature, but his high temperature is a valid indication that he is ill. Similarly our conscious 'performance', our protests, our emotions, our ethical principles, our moral considerations, our rationalisations and logical arguments around a particular Intention, are indications of the basic weakness of that Intention.

8 THESE CONSCIOUS MANIFESTATIONS HAVE TWO FUNCTIONS.

9 A) THEY ARE CREATED IN ORDER TO REINFORCE THE STRONGLY THREATENED INTENTION.

10 Generally this is in vain and the more frantic the emotion, the more complicated the logical argument, the more rigid the moral or ethical principle and the more desperate the justification; the less likely is the Intention ultimately to defeat, the Counter-intention. Just as the higher the person's temperature above normal, the less likely he is to live.

11 When all we require around the Intention is a stable emotion, a simple straight forward reality, a relaxed and flexible ethical code and no justification, there is every chance our Intention will be realized, just as a 'normal' temperature indicates an excellent chance of good health. But when the pressure has to be piled on through channels of both intellect and emotion, we can usually be sure that the Counter-intention is either way-out ahead or already 'home and dry'.

12 Examples:

1. When a person feels a desperate and obsessional need to prove that a decision he has made is the right one, we can be fairly sure that unconsciously he is either convinced or almost convinced that the decision was the Wrong one. An Intention to be right reflecting a stronger Counter-intention to be wrong.

2. When someone produces a long and complicated intellectual argument in favour of a particular attitude, in order to justify the attitude, the chances are that basically he holds precisely the reverse attitude, unconsciously, but no less powerfully. The protesting racial integrationist, who deep down has strong racial prejudices, which he is unwilling to know about consciously.

13 B) EXTREME AND INTENSE CONSCIOUS MANIFESTATIONS ARE OFTEN CREATED TO GIVE EVEN GREATER SCOPE AND OPPORTUNITY - INDIRECTLY - TO THE COUNTER-INTENTION.

14 By fixing your thoughts on the idea that the Intention is the thing you really want, you keep yourself unaware of the strength of the Counter-intention, or even the existence of it, thereby allowing it freedom to carry out its purpose in various devious, cover and heavily disguised ways, the responsibility for which you have no difficulty in shifting off yourself.

15 Example:

While a man is busy convincing himself and everyone else that he is just, scrupulous and considerate in his dealings with his associates, and is completely unconscious of a powerful unconscious need to cheat them in any way he can, this need quietly and unobtrusively manifests itself, in a series of apparent coincidences, in which he emerges successful while disasters of one kind or another befall those around him.

16 Where function 'A' ends and function 'B' begins can only be seen from the results. Feelings of love for someone may deter us from actually carrying out a consciously deliberate destructive action against that person. But on the other hand they will also prevent us from recognizing the covert destruction we are perpetrating on a completely unconscious level. Pity may urge us to help someone, but it will at the same time blind us to the fact that

our help is calculated to carry with it a predicament far worse than the one which it professes to relieve.

17 Examples:

1. Feelings of love incline us to provide justifications for people, to reassure them that all is well even when all is far from well. A parent tells his child that he is clever and will be a great success in the world, when he knows that the child has an intelligence well below average. Consciously he does it because he 'loves' the child and wants the child to feel good and confident. The ultimate outcome is that the child is painfully disillusioned at the much later date, both about his own mental capacity AND about his parents' trustworthiness.

2. Pity brings out the 'liberal' attitude, the welfare state, the 'handout mentality', the wish to pile material benefits on those who appear to lack them; a conscious wish to help. The end result of this is to pile upon the so-called 'beneficiaries' a greater and greater sense of guilt, failure and inadequacy. Evidence of this is plentiful in the extent to which such people eventually turn on their benefactors and attempt to destroy them.

18 As has been said, function 'A' is generally a vain one.
This means:

19 THE MOST EFFECTIVE FUNCTION OF ANY CONSCIOUS PERFORMANCE
AROUND AN INTENTION, IS THAT OF BLINDING US TO THE NATURE AND
INTENSITY, AND OFTEN THE EXISTENCE OF THE COUNTER-INTENTION.

20 Because we have long buried the knowledge that whatever happens to
us we have chosen that it should happen, the potential effectiveness of hiding
the Counter-intention behind conscious manifestations of the Intention is
limitless. Whatever happens to us, responsibility for it can always be shifted
onto something or somebody else.

21 Even when it becomes quite obvious that we have caused a situation,
there are always justifications to be found; like: 'I had no choice', 'It's
because of the way I was brought up', 'I was provoked', 'I didn't foresee the
consequences', 'I lost my temper', 'It was sheer bad luck'.

22 Our most basic and most powerful compulsive need can become as clear
as daylight by every circumstance and situation that arises around us, and yet
we can still see it as something other than OUR intention.

23 The extent to which humanity has convinced itself of the ultimate
validity of its conscious wishes and desires as being its true intentions,
ensures the unlimited supply of 'blinkers'.

24 PURE INTENTION IS A STRAIGHTFORWARD, UNCONFLICTED, NON-
COMPULSIVE DECISION TO DO OR TO BE SOMETHING, TO BRING ABOUT A
PARTICULAR OCCURRENCE OR TO CREATE A PARTICULAR EFFECT.

25 AS LONG AS WE ARE COMPULSIVE IN A PARTICULAR AREA, WE CANNOT
MANIFEST PURE INTENTION IN THAT AREA, BECAUSE AROUND
EVERYTHING THAT IS OF ANY CONCERN TO US WHATEVER, THERE IS
BOUND TO BE A CONFLICT. BUT AS WE RISE ABOVE THE LEVEL OF
COMPULSION IN A PARTICULAR AREA, THE CONFLICT OF INTENTION-
COUNTER-INTENTION FADES AND VANISHES, SO THAT NO 'PERFORMANCE' IS
NECESSARY AROUND THE INTENTION; IT BECOMES A PURE INTENTION.

26 We simply want to do something, and we do it. There is no great
manifestation of urgency, no rationalization, no justification, no desperation.
We do not HAVE to do the thing. We merely decide to do it, we choose to do it,
and we do it.

- 27 We may have conflicts in other areas, above or parallel to the area from which we are free of compulsions, but in that area there is no conflict, and therefore no 'performance'.
- 28 Because we have established that when there is urgency and desperation around there must be a heavy Counter-Intention, do not therefore assume that by suppressing or destroying the desperation we can defeat the Counter-intention. This is like saying that we can cure a sick person with a high temperature by putting him in a deep freeze for a few minutes to cool him down. Use the knowledge to recognize the presence of the Counter-Intention and accept it. Only then will you be able to resolve the conflict, and the desperation will go.
- 29 Also do not assume that if you have an Intention that is heavily reinforced consciously, then there is no point in acting according to its dictates because the Counter-intention is ultimately bound to win. Just as it is necessary to recognize and accept the presence of the Counter-intention in order to resolve the conflict, it is equally necessary to accept (and that may well mean to actually enact) the Intention. Resisting the dictates of the Intention may be just as effective in preserving the conflict as being blind to the existence and strength of the Counter-intention. For instance, one good effect of enacting the Intention to the full is to point out to ourselves just how strong the Counter-intention is, by witnessing its ultimate victory, in spite of conscious efforts to defeat it.
- 30 Example:
- Supposing you have a desperate conscious desire to make a lot of money, reflecting a powerful Counter-intention, if you make only a few half hearted attempts to realise your ambition, you will always be able to convince yourself that if you made a real effort, you could do it. Whereas if you go all out and open every possible door that might lead to wealth, you will very soon begin to appreciate the true power of your basic unwillingness to make money; the strength of the unconscious drive of the Counter-intention.
- 31 Remember above all that if you are to rise above compulsive conflict in any area, what matters is not what you do or do not do, but what you see, what you know, what you understand, about yourself and your conflicts, your intentions and your compulsions.
- 32 Action is Important in this context only in as much as the observation of the consequences of a particular action adds to the sum total of relevant knowledge. An intuitive awareness of consequences, without actually experiencing them, is not always forthcoming, and a logical assessment of them, however accurate, is not always totally convincing.
- 33 But:
- KNOWLEDGE AND AWARENESS ARE THE KEY; AND RIGHT ACTION STEMS ONLY FROM ACCURATE, PRECISE, COMPREHENSIVE AND RELEVANT KNOWLEDGE AND AWARENESS.
- 34 IGNORANCE IS THE BASIS OF ALL COMPULSIVE CONFLICT.

As it is, so be it.

August 1968

ROBERT DE GRIMSTON

THIS MATERIAL IS THE PROPERTY OF THE PROCESS

Return to [Logics](#)

Return to [Process Teachings](#)

LOGIC FOUR

Subject: REALITY AND ACCEPTANCE

1. 1 A PERSON'S LEVEL OF ACCEPTANCE IS THE LEVEL OF SCOPE AND
IMPORTANCE AT WHICH HE IS CAPABLE OF GIVING FULL CONSIDERATION TO IDEAS
AND EXPERIENCES THAT ARE NEW TO HIM.
- 2 A PERSON ONLY ACCEPTS WHAT IS 'REAL' TO HIM, i.e., meaningful,
comprehensible, on a place of understanding which is familiar to him.
- 3 An idea or concept is 'real' to somebody if it relates to his own
beliefs and experience, if it does not clash with the agreements he has with
himself about truth and untruth, possibility and impossibility.
- 4 These agreements, whether objectively sound or not, seem to the
person, necessary for his survival, and he compulsively rejects anything that
appears to threaten them.
- 5 The rigidity of the agreements depends on the extent of a person's
basic security and confidence.
- 6 A very frightened and insecure person has rigid agreements, which
allow for no deviation from a fixed pattern of belief, thought, emotion,
behavior, and experience.
- 7 A less frightened person has more fluid agreements. Gaps are
permitted in his pattern, allowance is made for changes of attitude, progress,
new experiences, new discoveries and new ideas. He is open to the expansion of
his scope, instead of being concerned only with the reducing or maintaining of
its limits.
- 8 Example:

A person may be quite open to the idea of a new game of cards to add to his
repertoire, or to the possibility that a prices and incomes policy is a good
idea, but suggest to him that he is totally responsible for everything that
happens to him, and his mind automatically shut down. The card game and the
prices and incomes policy, should they be included in his way of life, will
require no great upheavals or basic changes of attitude. They are no threat to
his fundamental pattern of agreements, so they can be considered fully and
without bias, and on relatively objective grounds. The idea of total personal
responsibility on the other hand, if accepted, would demand a complete reversal
of his entire picture of life and his position in it. This is unthinkable, and
consequently the idea must not on any account be given scrutiny, in case it
should prove to be valid.
- 9 As a person gets older the pattern of his agreements tends to
solidify against the threat of his environment. While he is still young he is
searching for a pattern to fit the basic knowledge that he has as a being. He
very rarely finds it, but he needs some sort of pattern (more or less
desperately, depending on his own basic strength), so he settles for substitutes
that at least preserve him against the dangers that threaten him. These he
builds around him like a fortress.
- 10 While he is in the early stages of building, show him something
better and there is a chance that he will consider it, but once he is firmly
ensconced, he dare not look at an alternative. If he did and it proved his
fortress invalid, he would either have to start all over again and confront the
fact of many wasted years, or, if he lacks the courage to do this, continue in
his existing pattern but with the knowledge that he was wrong. So he shuts his
mind against anything that does not fit snugly within the limits of his
fortress, in case it should shatter his security.
- 11 A person with a low level of acceptance often has the art of paying
lip service to all sorts of theories and ideas, without really seeing the

significance or implications of any of them. He hangs them on his walls for decoration, like picture postcards of places he has never visited.

- 12 He may display an apparent acceptance of an idea, but there is no personal involvement with it. He does not own it, or relate it to himself and his own life. He has inured himself to such involvement by a total depersonalization of everything. Every idea is reduced to a level of detached intellectual interest, and on this basis anything can be quite safely considered without fear of commitment. Emotionally it is given the same importance as buying a pair of socks. An unmistakable symptom of this pattern is the use of 'one' instead of 'I', particular in reference to personal problems. Instead of; 'I' can never express myself clearly, he says; "One" can never express oneself clearly. By making it everyone's problem, he can dismiss it as a natural hazard, instead of accepting it as a personal difficulty.

PRACTICAL APPLICATION

- 13 Don't talk to someone or question him outside his reality or above his level of acceptance. This is not contact. If you wish to tell someone something that will be unreal to him on his present level, begin within his reality and gently expand it until he can take the information and make good sense of it.
- 14 Remember it is only valid to help a person increase the scope of his reality and raise his acceptance level if you are doing it from the point of view of giving him something. If you are simply concerned with projecting yourself and your own image this is invalid.
- 15 If you ARE genuinely interested in giving to someone, take responsibility for doing it. If he is rejecting what you are offering, this is your failure and not his. You are invalidating him by pushing something at him that is outside his reality. Validate him. Project your interest in him so that he feels it. Accept his reality. Make it safe for him to talk to you. See the situation from his stand-point. If you do this he will have confidence in you and your interest in him; he will listen to you and accept what you are saying, and from this point you can begin to expand his reality and raise his level of acceptance.

As it is, so be it.

February 1969

ROBERT DE GRIMSTON

THIS MATERIAL IS THE PROPERTY OF THE PROCESS

Return to [Logics](#)
Return to [Process Teachings](#)

LOGIC FIVE

Subject: RESISTANCE

1. 1 RESISTANCE IS THE CONSCIOUS OR UNCONSCIOUS ACT OF PREVENTING
YOURSELF FROM ENACTING SOMETHING, WHETHER IT BE IN THE FORM OF
DOING, BEING, HAVING, THINKING, FEELING, SEEING, HEARING, KNOWING,
OR BEING THE EFFECT OF SOMETHING.
- 2 Conscious resistance is a manifestation in support of the
'intention' side of an unconscious conflict. Consequently it is fair to assume
that whatever we resist consciously we are almost certain to enact it eventually
in one form or another or we are already enacting it without being conscious of
the fact.
- 3 Example:

A person has destructive urges towards his friend. He feels like insulting him
or laughing at him or even hitting him. Quite consciously he resists the urges.
This means that on a level of purely conscious motivation the manifestations of
his need NOT to be destructive outweigh the manifestations of his need to
destroy.

Therefore, unconsciously, the need to destroy is the stronger. Either the man
is already being destructive towards his friend in ways far more subtle and
devious than those which he is conscious of resisting, or his destruction will
finally emerge in one form or another, either openly and apparently beyond his
control, or covertly and unrecognizably.
- 4 The first possibility is the more likely of the two, because the
unconscious mind never plays a waiting game (unless it is specifically and
compulsively doing just that) if it can find a way of getting immediate
satisfaction; and it generally can. So it is probable that while the person is
making an outward show of resisting his destructive urges, he is at the same
time dropping poison around his friend in the guise of help and goodwill, making
his friend feel inferior by flaunting his superior qualities around him, making
him feel rejected by treating him in an offhand manner, invalidating him by
being disdainful of his most personal problems or any other of the numerous ways
that people use to drag one another down without appearing - even to themselves
- to do so.
- 5 So one important thing about conscious resistance is that basically
it does not work! It is only there because of the superior strength of the
counter-intention against which it is directed.
- 6 Unconscious resistance, which has no conscious manifestation in the
form of a desire to resist or a feeling of the rightness of resistance, is a far
more real and powerful element. It IS the counter-intention.
- 7 In this case we have a conscious wish NOT to resist; to accept, to
feel, to act, to commit ourselves, to become involved in the direction which we
are unconsciously resisting.
- 8 So here the intention is to accept, while the strong counter-
intention is to resist, and the more we try consciously to break our own
resistance, to allow our true feelings to manifest, to act according to our
instincts, the more solid and effective that resistance becomes.
- 9 Example:

A man finds he is apparently unable to feel any love for his children.

Let us suppose that the feeling is there, but he is resisting being aware of it for fear of the emotional consequences of allowing himself to feel and therefore express it. He has an unconscious agreement that feeling and expressing love for his children makes him vulnerable, particularly to their possible rejection of him and his love.

Now consciously he would like to feel such love, and at the same time he thinks he ought to feel it. So he tries to create it. He decides to spend more time with them, yet more interested in their personal problems. He tries to make his relationship with them less formal and stilted. He allows them more freedom.

No love manifests. (Solutions of this kind have no effect whatever on unconscious resistance). If anything the resistance becomes stronger; because of the threat of the greater physical proximity with his children which the man is forcing upon himself.

10 RESISTANCE IS THE LAST STEP IN THE PROCESS OF NON-ACCEPTANCE

11 If we're unable simply to:

1. NOT ACCEPT the existence, presence and reality of a situation; if it is unavoidably THERE, and involving us; then we at once attempt to deny our own personal:

2. RESPONSIBILITY in and for the situation.

If however we cannot escape from our sense of responsibility, then we shut down:

3. Our AWARENESS of the situation, its nature and its implications; we become blind to it.

If we cannot fail to see the situation and our part in it, we find something or someone to:

4. BLAME for it.

If we cannot establish the blame to our own and everyone else's satisfaction, and the responsibility returns to us, then we are reduced to:

5. DEFENDING some part of ourselves and our agreements against the implications and consequences of the situation.

If this proves to be impossible we:

6. JUSTIFY ourselves and our part in the situation. We attempt to make it 'right' where it feels 'wrong'.

If this also fails, we dig our toes in solidly and:

7. RESIST.

This we do by creating barriers and allowing no part of the situation to penetrate them.

We resist receiving any effects the situation might create on us, and we resist creating any effects on the situation.

We deny ourselves any knowledge, awareness, true emotion, meaningful action, or even relevant thought in relation to the situation. In fact DISTORTED emotion, MEANINGLESS activity and IRRELEVANT thought are frequently compulsively used for the purpose of resisting; the last being the most effective, the most available and therefore the most commonly used for all.

12 Example:

A man finds he is unable simply NOT TO ACCEPT the fact of his inability to get on with people. The evidence stares him in the face and he cannot reject it.

Consequently he attempts to deny RESPONSIBILITY for this state of affairs. He tries to establish that the result is none of his.

However he finds he cannot do this either. All the indications point towards the contrary, i.e., that he himself, his own behavior and attitudes, lie at the root of the trouble. So he closes down his AWARENESS of these indications. He shuts his eyes to the signs; the ways in which he deliberately alienates and antagonizes people.

But if these become too obvious to him, and he cannot fail to see them, he is forced to find a more positive and active form of rejection. He resorts to BLAME. He actively tries to force responsibility for the situation onto another person or onto circumstances 'outside his control', by means of accusation or direct attack. So he BLAMES his attitudes on the people to whom they are directed. He blames his behavior on the way in which he has been brought up.

If this fails to convince him, or anyone else, he is reduced to DEFENDING the image he has of himself as basically a very friendly and likeable person, against all the contrary evidence, and protesting that really underneath he is very amenable and co-operative, and so on. He magnifies every minute piece of evidence in support of the 'friendly' image and plays down all signs of the opposite.

If that does not work; still no one, including himself, is convinced, and he finds the reality of his position incontrovertible - he is unable NOT to realise the fact that he is malicious, sarcastic, untrustworthy and totally lacking in warmth and affection - he resorts to JUSTIFICATION. This consists of making success out of failure; making right what he sees as wrong. He endeavours to reconcile himself with his state by telling himself that it's not really so bad to be like that, a good thing in fact - or at least that it does not matter, that it's not important, and therefore not wrong.

Finally if this does not convince him, if he does not FEEL justified, but still feels guilty and depressed about himself and his relationships, he resorts to the last weapon in the line, which is RESISTANCE. He blocks everything. He digs in his toes and refuses to see or feel anything REAL about the situation at all, and also to do or think anything relevant about it. He blocks all his sensitivity in this area, and puts his attention and directs his activities elsewhere. Consequently the whole state becomes completely solidified.

- 13 But remember: situations are never simple, and the human mind is a turmoil. (Unconsciously it manifests the equivalent of conscious drunkenness). So in actuality, all these steps are both inter-related and interchangeable.
- 14 The above is a simple basic pattern, but the permutations in which this ladder of Non-Acceptance can be used are limitless.
- 15 For example, certain Steps can be regarded as forms of other steps. Non-Acceptance is itself a form of Resistance. Blaming is a way of shifting Responsibility. Shifting Responsibility is a way of Justifying. Justifying is a way of Defending. Unawareness is another form of Resistance. So is Defense. And Resistance is a form of Non-Acceptance.
- 16 Particularly, both the top step, the most abstract, Non-Acceptance, and the bottom step, the most solid, Resistance, are contained in all of the others. Non-Responsibility, Unawareness, Blame, Defense, and Justification, are all of them forms, both of Non-Acceptance and of Resistance.
- 17 All the steps between the top and bottom are interchangeable. Active Blame may appear AFTER Justification has failed. Rejection of Responsibility may follow an inability to be Unaware of a situation. Defense may come immediately AFTER Non-Acceptance has failed.
- 18 So within the basic Resistance pattern, allow for complications in the sequence. When a drunken man descends a ladder he is unlikely to keep rigidly and precisely to the order of the rungs.

As it is, so be it.

11th June 1969

ROBERT DE GRIMSTON

THIS MATERIAL IS THE PROPERTY OF THE PROCESS

Return to [Logics](#)

Return to [Process Teachings](#)

LOGIC SIX

Subject: TESTING

1. 1 IN ANY IMPORTANT SITUATION, BEFORE A PERSON COMMITS HIMSELF TO
ANY SORT OF INVOLVEMENT OR DEPENDENCE, HE FEELS HE MUST
ENSURE THAT THE SITUATION CAN GIVE HIM THE SECURITY HE REQUIRES.
THEREFORE HE TESTS IT.
- 2 TESTING IS PERFORMED UNCONSCIOUSLY.
- 3 It follows the rules of the accepted scientific method, which
requires that the scientist forms a theoretical hypothesis and then tries
systematically to destroy it. It is then considered valid only to the extent to
which it survives the destruction.
- 4 If A contemplates an involvement in some sort of relationship with
B, he will systematically try to destroy the possibility of such a relationship,
meanwhile gradually involving himself more and more, according to the extent
that the relationship survives the tests.
- 5 If he manages to destroy any likelihood or possibility of having the
kind of relationship he requires, he abandons the situation. If he cannot
destroy the possibility of a relationship with B, he continues to involve
himself to a greater and greater extent, his tests becoming more and more
extreme.
- 6 How far he is prepared to go depends on how deeply his own
compulsive needs require him to be involved in and committed to that particular
relationship. If he requires - and the situation seems to promise - a very
intense degree of involvement, perhaps to the point of his total dependence upon
it, then his tests will be carried to the ultimate. If he is prepared to settle
for a lesser degree of involvement, and there is no sign that the relationship
will offer anything further, then his commitment will increase to a certain
point and stop. He need not abandon the situation. So long as it offers him
part of what he requires, and does not preclude him from deeper involvements in
other relationships that can offer him more security, there is no reason for him
to abandon it.
- 7 Take the example of A contemplating a relationship with B. He may
find that an association with B offers nothing more than a casual friendship.
If he wants such a friendship he can maintain it and test the relationship no
further. If, however, such a friendship either gives him no satisfaction or
threatens to prevent him from satisfying his deeper need in some other
relationship, he abandons it and looks for that other relationship.
- 8 TESTING IS CARRIED OUT IN THREE STAGES.
- 9 THE FIRST MOVE IS TO CREATE EFFECTS AROUND THE SITUATION.
- 10 For security, a person needs something that is capable of being
stronger than him, something that he can depend on rather than something that is
totally dependent on him. He is very much aware of his own inadequacies; and
consequently he must find situations and relationships that will absorb these
inadequacies; neutralise, supplement or offset them, and not be total effect of
them. So if the situation is too susceptible to his effects, moves with every
wind he blows at it, has no strength or identity of its own separate from him,
then it has proved weaker than him in all directions. He can be sure it will
give him no security.
- 11 Taking again A's relationship with B. If A finds that B is complete
effect of him and gives nothing of his own volition, causes nothing, influences
none of his moves, creates no effects of his own, then A knows he can expect no
security from the relationship. He may, if there is some satisfaction in it,
maintain the association, but he will not involve himself, he will sacrifice

nothing to the relationship and place no trust in it. He may also become suspended by B's dependence on him, either through guilt or through a need to boost his ego. But whether A abandons his relationship with B or uses it for some secondary purpose that involves no dependence on it, the fact remains that it has fallen down on the test. He has destroyed it by proving its complete inausativeness and inability to support or sustain him in any direction.

- 12 If, however, a situation survives this initial test, if in the example A is unable to create all the effects he wishes, the relationship has a strength of its own; B, in other words, is capable of meeting his effects and changing, modifying, or preventing them, and of creating effects in return; A may not consciously like this, but unconsciously, for him, the test is going well. There is the promise of security, or dependence, sustenance, help, contribution; of a relationship in fact to which he can safely commit himself.
- 13 THE CONSCIOUS ANTI-REACTION (mentioned above) IS USED AS A SPUR TO THE SECOND STAGE OF THE TEST, WHICH IS DIRECT DESTRUCTION.
- 14 This begins mildly enough. A might start this stage of his test with B by creating a disagreement between them, or by mildly ridiculing B, or by letting him down, or by ignoring him. If either B or the relationship collapses under this gentle barrage, that's that. A may need quite a lot of convincing, so he may pick up the pieces and apply the test again, but when he is finally convinced that the relationship cannot take it, the test is over.
- 15 If on the other hand, the relationship sustains the barrage, A will involve himself even further and step up the intensity of the destruction.
- 16 The extent to which he will go in bringing his entire armoury of weapons to bear on this, will depend on both the nature of the relationship, and how much he is demanding and expecting from it. If he foresees and wants a deep and lasting and intense relationship with a high degree of mutual trust and dependence, he will bring out every destructive force he can muster, both open and disguised.
- 17 THE MOST EFFECTIVE FORM OF DIRECT DESTRUCTION IS TO BRING FAILURE ON THE PERSON OR SITUATION BEING TESTED.
- 18 For example, A puts B into a position where he is bound to have a personal failure, introduces him to someone else who he knows will not like B, or brings him into an environment where he knows B will show up unfavourably, gives him a challenge that he knows he cannot possibly meet, gives him some important misinformation that he knows B will act on with disastrous results. Or A attempts to create a sense of failure WITHIN his relationship with B. He brings discord into it, causes strife between the two of them, creates barriers and presents difficulties that put a price on the relationship, thus testing its strength and value.
- 19 THE EXTENT OF PEOPLE'S INTENTION AND ABILITY TO DESTROY ONE ANOTHER AND THEIR RELATIONSHIPS WITH ONE ANOTHER, IS ENORMOUS, AND GENERALLY TOTALLY UNRECOGNISED EITHER BY THEMSELVES OR BY ANYONE ELSE. EVERY DISASTER IS MORE THAN ADEQUATELY COVERED BY A BATTERY OF JUSTIFICATIONS THAT BLIND EVERYONE CONCERNED TO ITS REAL CAUSES.
- 20 So the test goes on; A, confident in his protection against having to take responsibility for what he is doing, by reason of the justifications, and B, utterly unaware of what is going on.
- 21 There are five ways in which the relationship can manifest failure at any point of the 'direct destruction' stage of the test.
 1. B collapses. This is not necessarily conclusive. A will probably pick up the pieces and try again. But the final failure is when A finds he no longer has the inclination to pick up the pieces. He has then proved to himself that the relationship is not important enough to him to make this worthwhile.
 2. B has a major failure which shows him in a very poor light, and A finds that as a result of this he loses interest in his relationship with B.
 3. B rejects A. This also is not necessarily conclusive on its own. A then assesses his own attitude. If he feels inclined to effect a reconciliation then the relationship is not finally destroyed for him. It is still able to hold him. If he at once loses interest and feels the relationship

is not worth the trouble of patching it up, then it has failed the test and he abandons it.

4. B rejects A and in no circumstances can be reconciled. This is conclusive when A feels he has given all he is capable of giving towards recreating the relationship and still B rejects him. This satisfies him that the relationship is invalid; B is not dependable. (If A is not prepared to give whatever is required to bring about a reconciliation then the test has failed on basis 3).

5. A reduces his evaluation of his relationship with B to a point where he can reject B, abandon the relationship and feel no 'hang-over' of involvement with B - apart, perhaps, from some guilt for the destruction perpetrated.

22 There are also five ways in which the relationship can manifest survival of the test.

1. B prevents the destruction, or, when it is directed straight at him, is unaffected by it. He does not fail when he is supposed to, or avoids the failure situation set up for him. Again A goes as far as is necessary for his demands, and if B and the relationship prove indestructible they have survived this stage of the test.

2. B has a major failure in a situation which A has set up for him, but A finds that instead of losing interest in the relationship as a result of this, he is still drawn to B, either in spite of the failure or even because of it.

3. B is aware of the destruction that is being directed at him and the relationship, confronts A with what he is doing, and so demonstrates his own control of the situation.

4. B rejects A, but A finds that the relationship is of such value to him that he is prepared to do whatever is required to bring about a reconciliation, and that a reconciliation is possible.

5. A attempts to reduce his evaluation of his relationship with B, to reject B and to abandon the relationship, but finds that he cannot destroy his feelings of involvement with B. The relationship has survived, resist though he may.

23 THE THIRD AND FINAL STAGE OF THE TEST IS SELF-DESTRUCTION.

24 This ranges from mild self-reduction to driving oneself into the depths of abject misery and despair. Still the test is directed ultimately at the overall situation, which can fail it in the following four ways, again taking the example of A's relationship with B.

1. At any point in this stage of the test, B rejects A for his failure or his uselessness or the fact that his depressions are a bore, and A finds he is not himself sufficiently interested to do whatever is required for a reconciliation.

2. B rejects A and nothing that A is capable of doing will make him change his mind.

3. A identifies his failures, inadequacies and misery with his relationship with B, and decides that the relationship is not worth the suffering it brings him.

4. A finds that he can reduce himself into an abysmally low state, and that B is either unable or unwilling to bring him up again. There is no security there.

25 Success at this last stage of the test also manifests in four ways.

1. B accepts A's failures and inadequacies and maintains the relationship in spite of them.

2. A finds that in spite of occasions of misery, failure, despair and degradation around the relationship, he still feels it is worthwhile.
3. B is both willing and able to relieve A of his unhappiness whenever necessary.
4. B rejects A for his failings but A finds he is prepared to do whatever is required to bring about a reconciliation and that a reconciliation is possible.

- 26 This is the final stage of the test. If after all this the relationship seems to provide security for him a person commits himself to it to the limit of intensity and involvement that the extensiveness of his test allows.
- 27 Of course, the testing does not end there for all time. The human mind is devious, suspicious and never fully satisfied, there will be tests from time to time in various directions. A will always be wondering how far and in how many directions the security of the relationship will go, whether its degree of security has changed for the better or for the worse, and so on.
- 28 In addition to this, if B is also seeking security in the relationship, he too must test it in whatever way is applicable and natural to him. This, of course, complicates the situation.
- 29 In our example we have looked at only ONE side of ONE personal relationship, but remember:
- 30 IN ALL RELATIONSHIPS THERE IS TESTING OF ONE KIND OR ANOTHER GOING ON ALL THE TIME ON BOTH SIDES. THIS APPLIES NOT ONLY TO PEOPLE'S INDIVIDUAL RELATIONSHIPS WITH ONE ANOTHER, BUT TO THEIR RELATIONSHIPS WITH GROUPS, IDEALS, BELIEFS AND ENVIRONMENTS. PEOPLE ARE ALWAYS TESTING ALL THEIR RELATIONSHIPS TO ALL THINGS.

As it is, so be it.

3rd June 1968

ROBERT DE GRIMSTON

THIS MATERIAL IS THE PROPERTY OF THE PROCESS

Return to [Logics](#)

Return to [Process Teachings](#)

LOGIC SEVEN

Subject: HOSTILITY

1. 1 A HOSTILE ACT IS AN ACTION OR NON ACTION WHICH IS AGAINST THE
CODE OF RIGHT AND WRONG OF THE PERSON PERFORMING IT.
- 2 Such acts can be very minor actions which a person performs against
himself, such as falling over and hurting himself, losing a valued possession,
failing to meet an appointment and thereby causing trouble for himself, and so
on; or they can be far reaching activities involving millions of people, such as
leading a nation into war, inciting to genocide, instituting a programme of
religious persecution, causing an economic slump, etc. And they can be anything
in between these two extremes.
- 3 They can be failures to act where there is a sense of obligation,
compulsion or necessity to act, as well as positive actions.
- 4 WHAT IS A HOSTILE ACT FOR ONE PERSON MAY NOT BE FOR ANOTHER.
The criterion is whether or not the person PERFORMING the act
CONSIDERS it hostile, either consciously or unconsciously.
- 5 CONSCIOUS HOSTILITY
- 6 This is when a person feels consciously that what he has done (or
failed to do) is hostile, either to himself or to someone else or to several
other people. He feels consciously that it is WRONG.
- 7 Examples:
 1. A shouts in anger at B and then immediately feels guilty
for having done so. He feels he has committed a hostility against B. He
feels quite consciously, that he has gone against his own personal code
of right and wrong.
 2. B forgets to give A a very important message, and as a
result A is considerably inconvenienced and also blames B for the
inconvenience. B feels bad on three counts. First he feels guilty
about forgetting. It goes against his own code of efficiency and precision;
a hostility against himself. Secondly, he feels bad about having
inconvenienced A; a hostility against A. And finally, he feels bad
about incurring A's displeasure; another hostility against himself.
All three quite conscious.
- 8 UNCONSCIOUS HOSTILITY
- 9 This is when a person goes against his own code of right and wrong
without being consciously aware of it. This can either be because he is not
conscious of that particular aspect of his own code, or because he is not aware
of what he has done or failed to do.
- 10 Example:
 3. A asks B to come to his house. B arrives and they talk. Then they quarrel
and B leaves in a very unhappy state. Now A feels bad as a result, but he does

not know precisely why. He does not feel as though he has done anything hostile to B. The quarrel was two-sided, and in fact B started it. But this does not make A feel any better.

Unconsciously A has an agreement with himself that what happens in his house is his responsibility, and that he should never allow a guest to leave his house in an unhappy state. That is part of his code of right and wrong. No amount of justification or extenuating circumstances, however firmly it may convince him consciously, will alter that rigid unconscious agreement. In his terms, though he is not aware of it, he has been hostile towards his friend B by allowing him to go off dissatisfied. To do such a thing is against his morale code.

4. A tells B something which hurts his feelings. A is quite conscious of the fact that he feels it is wrong to hurt other people's feelings, but he is quite unconscious of the fact that this is what he has done. However his unconsciousness, being far more sensitive than his consciousness, knows what has happened and reacts accordingly. A feels discomfort stemming from his unconscious guilt, but because he has not realized the effect he has created on B, he does not know where the discomfort is coming from.

- 11 Conscious hostility is fairly straight forward. But as you can see, unconscious hostility is fraught with all kinds of possible pitfalls and problems.
- 12 For one thing conscious codes of right and wrong may seem sane and rational, at least to the person possessing them, but a person's unconscious codes would very often seem completely ridiculous, even to himself if he knew what they were.
- 13 For example a person may quite well have an unconscious agreement with himself that he will have committed a terrible hostility against his child if his child does not turn out to be a genius. Absurd - but not to his unconsciousness, which has decided that that is so. Or he may have an equally strong unconscious agreement that he must always fail in whatever he does; that it is morally wrong for him to succeed. Again, absurd - but that is the decision of his unconsciousness, and the result is that success gives him a feeling of unease and discomfort, or perhaps embarrassment, which he cannot explain because he is not aware of the fact that for him, to succeed is a hostile act.
- 14 Another problem with unconscious hostilities is that unconscious moral codes are very often in a state of even conflict, so that to take a particular action is hostile, but not to take it is equally hostile, possibly in a different direction.
- 15 This can manifest consciously of course; such as when you have a difficult decision to make because either way someone gets hurt. But when the conflict is conscious and in the open, it is generally not hard to handle or come to terms with.
- 16 But when the conflict is unconscious, doubts and uncertainties and dilemmas arise without the person knowing where they are coming from.
- 17 For example, a person may feel - quite unconsciously - that it is his moral duty to keep himself in isolation from other people, not to become involved with them, not to make close contact with them, not to become involved with them, not to make close contact with them, not to be known by them, and so on; but at the same time on another level he feels - again quite unconsciously - that his function is to spread happiness, to make people feel good, and if he is failing to fulfill this function that is a hostile non-action. Imagine the problems such a person has in his contact with people. All the time he is committing a hostility one way or the other. He feels the dissatisfaction, but he has no idea what it stems from.

18 When someone performs what is for him a hostile act, he has basically two courses open to him. Either he can recognise the act for what it is in his terms and accept responsibility for having performed it, or he can reject it and his responsibility for it.

19 The first of these alternatives entails seeing clearly the full extent and significance of the act and to whom it is hostile, deliberately chosen to perform it.

20 Examples:

5. A. Is rude to B and makes B unhappy. A feels bad about this, recognises that he has quite deliberately and purposely created this effect on B and that in his terms it is a hostility. That is an acceptance of responsibility.

6. A falls downstairs and sprains his ankle. He recognises that the fall was entirely his own doing. No one made him fall, nothing compelled him to fall - outside of himself. The hostility against himself was performed by him alone.

21 Rejection of responsibility for a hostile act can take several forms.

22 I. Unconsciousness. Responsibility for an unconscious hostility is automatically rejected by its being unconscious. If someone does not know, for whatever reason, that he has been hostile, then he cannot accept responsibility for having been hostile.

23 Example:

7. A tells B a story about C which turns B against C. This, in A's terms is a hostile act against both of them, but he is quite unaware of the effect he has created. He has blinded himself to the significance of the story he has told, and therefore does not realise what he has done.

This is a rejection of responsibility. By ignorance of the effects of his action he avoids having to face up to them.

24 II. Justification. Even if a person knows that what he has done is hostile, he can still reject responsibility for it by justifying. He can say: he couldn't help it, he had no choice, it wasn't his fault, or he can say: he didn't realise.... he didn't know.... he wasn't aware.... he forgot... (which of course may be true, but it simply goes back to the unconsciousness form of rejection). In some way or other he can contradict, both for his own 'benefit' and for other people's if necessary, his feeling of guilt at what he has done. He feels he has done wrong; by justifying he tries to convince himself and anyone else concerned that he has not done wrong. This is justification.

25 Example:

B. A trips B, and B injures himself. A feels guilt, but insists that it wasn't really his fault, because something got in his eye, so he couldn't see where he was going...etc.

26 III. Blame. This is a more active and positive form of justification. Responsibility is given to another person or group of people,

very often the person against whom the hostile act is performed. 'It was his fault'; 'He made me do it'; 'I didn't do it, he did'; 'He shouldn't have got in the way'; 'If he'd told me, I would have...'; 'They forced me into it'; and so on. Basically the same object; a person trying to convince himself that he has not done wrong when he feels he has done wrong; this time by passing the responsibility to someone else.

27 Example:

9. A misses an appointment with B and feels bad about it. But he blames B for not having made it clear where the appointment was to be. In this way he attempts to vindicate himself by putting the responsibility for the wrongness onto B.

28 IV. Minimisation of the hostility. This is again a variation on simple justification. It is trying to make the hostility less of a hostility, trying to minimise its importance or significance or the scope of its effects; if possible trying to make it into no hostility at all.

29 'But it didn't really do him any harm'; 'She deserved it'; 'He didn't suffer'; 'It could have been worse'; 'I only said...'; 'I just told him to...'; 'I was only trying to help'; 'It was really a good thing after all'; 'It's in the interests of the public good'; 'In fact they could benefit from it'.

30 Example:

10. A tells his boss that his colleague B is an idler. As a result B loses his job. A feels guilty, but insists that it was his duty to report B and anyway B will have no difficulty in getting another job.

Here is an illustration of the illogicality that stems from the fact that justifications DO NOT WORK. If A feels guilty about what he has done to B, no amount of justification of any kind will truly satisfy his conscience. So although he tells himself that he has done his duty and therefore no wrong, he is clearly not convinced, because he still has to minimize the effect on B in terms of him finding other employment. If he REALLY felt he had done no more than his duty, he would not need to belittle the detrimental effect on B.

31 With unconscious hostilities, already we are rejecting responsibility by the very fact of them being unconscious.

32 With conscious hostilities, we can either accept full responsibility, or we can justify - remembering the extent of the territory covered by the term justification - and thereby reject responsibility.

2 . 1 THE EFFECT ON SOMEONE OF PERFORMING A HOSTILE ACT, DEPENDS ON WHETHER HE ACCEPTS OR REJECTS HIS SENSE OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE ACT.

2 If he accepts his sense of responsibility, the act need have no lasting detrimental effect on him. Probably he will communicate his feelings of responsibility to whomever else is involved, reverse the situation as far as it is possible for him to do so, undo anything that can be undone, and at once start contributing positively to the situation.

3 This is the most he can do, and if every part of it is done to the limit of his capability then he is left with no bad feelings. It may take time and it may entail some form of suffering by way of expiation, but as long as there is a full awareness of responsibility, it will be effective.

4 In some cases all that is necessary is the complete acceptance of responsibility, in others a person demands action of himself to make truly

right, in his terms, what he feels is a wrong situation which he has created. The extent of requirement depends entirely on the nature of the hostile act and how the individual himself FEELS about it. There can be no objective rule.

- 5 What we are dealing with here are not objective facts but subjective realities; the agreements and decisions of each individual human mind; the demands, both conscious and unconscious, which a person makes upon himself.
- 6 We can generalise, because there are common denominators in all human beings. We can be sure of the overall structure, but not of the separate idiosyncrasies. They vary from one individual to another.
- 7 IF SOMEONE REJECTS HIS SENSE OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR A HOSTILE ACT, BY WHATEVER METHOD, UNCONSCIOUSNESS OR JUSTIFICATION, HE CREATES A DETRIMENTAL EFFECT UPON HIMSELF.
- 8 I. Unconsciousness. If he suppresses his awareness of a hostility or the full extent and significance of a hostility, then the conflict between his unconscious sense of guilt and his need to shelve the responsibility by unawareness, enacts itself on a completely unconscious level. Discomfort of some kind automatically results; sometimes physical, sometimes mental. On one side he wants to take the blame upon himself and expiate or undo what he feels he has done; on the other side he wants to be blameless. All he is conscious of is the sense of discomfort that comes to the surface as a result of this dichotomy.
- 9 He does not know where the discomfort comes from but he must pin it on something.
- 10 The thing that appears to him to have caused it, is the situation in which the hostility was committed. And the liveliest 'agent' within that a situation, is the person or people against whom it was committed. So he identifies the discomfort with that person or those people - and perhaps the situation or the environment as well if they are distinctive enough.
- 11 This automatically produces with him a negative attitude or reaction towards that person, those people, that situation, and/or that environment. His own individual nature will decide which, and also what form the negative attitude will take.
- 12 It could be resentment, dislike, fear, hatred, embarrassment, envy, suspicion, scorn, boredom, repulsion; any negative feeling or attitude that the individual unconsciousness chooses to push into the consciousness in order to tackle the threat in the situation, to keep it at bay; the threat being whatever it has decided is causing the discomfort.
- 13 Examples:

11. A says something to B which makes B feel bad. A is unaware of the effect he has created and of his own deliberate, though unconscious, intention of creating it.

Unconsciously he is aware of both, and unconsciously he feels guilty for what he has done. But because he is unwilling to accept responsibility either for the action or its motive, a conflict ensues between feeling responsible and wanting to reject the responsibility.

A begins to feel uncomfortable around B. He rationalises this feeling by finding something wrong with B and resenting him for it. He decides that B is stupid, or ugly, or dishonest. B may well be all three, but the important thing here is that A USES one of these things, whether it is true or imaginary, to explain his discomfort around B. Then he resents B for it.

It does not make A feel any better. His resentment of B drives him towards committing further quite conscious hostilities against B, which he then justifies by means of B's 'deficiency'. Therefore still no acceptance of responsibility; so more discomfort; resentment develops into scorn; more hostilities; and so on. A's relationship with B deteriorates rapidly and disastrously, into a state of complete alienation.

This simple sequence of events - with B doing roughly the same thing to A - is the basic thread that runs through the story of most human marriage relationships. The end result may not be a physical alienation, but a state of mutual non-contact and non-understanding.

12. A fails to impress his teachers and his colleagues at school with his intelligence. This failure is a hostile act against himself, so he feels. He may be completely oblivious of it, or he may be aware of it but not regard it consciously as a failure and therefore a hostility. Either way he rejects by unconsciousness his own sense of responsibility for having been hostile to himself. But again, unconsciously he knows, and the conflict between this knowledge and his need to reject responsibility for it, gives him intense discomfort.

The discomfort he is not unconscious of, and he associates it with his school environment and the people in that environment.

So he finds things wrong with his school, his teachers and his colleagues. He is afraid of them. They intimidate him. He blames them for his unhappiness. He alienates himself from them.

After he leaves school he looks back on his days there with distaste. Behind the distaste is shame and regret, which he does not want to look at. If he did he might have to look at what he feels ashamed and regretful about; his own personal failure, his hostile act against himself.

14 II. Simple justification. If a person cannot fail to be conscious of his hostile act and its significance, but still wants to reject his sense of responsibility for it, he tries to justify it.

15 Now his justification may be true; it may be valid; but he is trying to use a superficial objective fact to neutralise a subjective reality which is deeply rooted. However hard he tells himself that he was not to blame, that he couldn't help it; his guilt, his underlying sense of responsibility, remains. He feels basically that he WAS to blame and that he COULD have helped it, and that is what matters.

16 So as long as he tries to justify, he aggravates the conflict of acceptance and rejection of responsibility. Discomfort results and the same kind of sequence takes place as has been described above.

17 Examples:

13. A fails to help B in a situation where he feels that he could and should do so. He is aware of the failure but he justifies it by saying that he had not realized how urgent the situation was, or he was not able to keep his appointment with B because he was delayed by unavoidable circumstances, or whatever justification seems most convincing both to himself and B and anyone else concerned.

His justification may be a fact, and it may even convince him on a conscious level. It may convince B; it may convince everyone. But it is no march for A's unconscious sense of responsibility. The two create a conflict and discomfort results.

The discomfort is most probably associated with B, and the cycle of alienation begins.

14. A boy fails an examination. He feels he has let himself down by the failure and thereby committed a hostile act against himself. But unwilling to accept the responsibility for this, he justifies by saying that he was unable to do as much preparation work for the exam as was necessary, or that he was not feeling well which spoiled his concentration, or the examination conditions were distracting, or the questions were not what he had been led to expect. But again, even if his justification is factually true, it cannot erase his unconscious sense of personal failure, and the inevitable discomfort ensues.

What he pins his resultant negative attitudes on depends upon the circumstances. It could be the subject of the exam, the environment in which it took place, the organization which set it, examinations in general, the environment in which he prepared for it, the people who helped him prepare, or even people who have passed the examination which he has failed. It could be any or, to one degree or another, all of these. And whichever he pins it on, his relationship with that or those aspects deteriorates accordingly.

18 III. Blame. The more active and in many ways more desperate form of justification. Where the hostility is committed against an individual, the blame is generally direct towards that individual, which leads very quickly into a deterioration of the relationship with him.

19 Often the blame itself constitutes another hostile act, and even if it doesn't it generally drives the person directing the blame into committing one. So the deterioration here can be very fast indeed.

20 Examples:

15. A fails to appear for an appointment with B and feels guilty. Unwilling to bear the responsibility, and unable to find a workable circumstantial justification for the failure, A blames B for not having reminded him of the appointment or for not having made the time and place of it clear.

He is consciously convinced by this passing of the responsibility, but that is as deep as the conviction goes. Unconsciously he not only has the usual conflict - guilt versus a wish to shift the blame - but now he also has another conflict stemming from what he feels is an invalid accusation against B, which for him constitutes a further hostility.

He maintains his attitude of blame, however, and his relationship with B goes into an immediate decline.

16. A father feels a sense of failure in bringing up his child. He feels he has not given it the security or control or companionship that it requires. This he feels is a hostility against the child, and against the child's mother, and against himself.

Not wanting to carry the burden of guilt which this sense of failure gives him, and finding no convincing justification in terms of the fault being no one's, he blames the child's mother.

He accuses her of having spoilt the child, or of not having allowed him to discipline the child, or of having been too harsh with the child herself, or whatever is most convincing in the circumstances.

His accusation may be completely valid, one hundred percent true; she may even be feeling guilty for precisely the thing he accuses her of. It makes no difference. He is not pointing it out to her in order to improve the situation, to help her and the child; he is using it to try to salve his own guilty conscience. It doesn't work. He can only usefully and validly draw her attention to her sense of failure AFTER he has fully come to terms with his own; and that means accepting his sense of responsibility for it, and acting accordingly.

(The lesson of the mote and the beam is not a lesson in morality but straight psychology, brilliantly and logically applied.)

In this situation the father is simply shifting the burden of responsibility. As a result, according to the usual pattern, his relationship with the child and its mother deteriorates, as he makes them the cause of his discomfort. And as blaming the mother is probably another hostility in itself - if not it will anyway produce several other hostilities - his relationship with her deteriorates particularly rapidly.

Remembering that both mother and child are probably enacting similar patterns, it is not hard to visualize the steady decline of the overall family relationship. And there is a permutation of this basic pattern in almost every human home.

17. A boy feels a growing sense of frustration and dissatisfaction with himself as he reaches maturity. He feels he is failing to fulfil his own demands upon himself, to come up to his own self-imposed standards of ability and achievement. He feels he is letting himself down, and quite likely he feels he is letting his parents down as well.

He feels guilty, but at the same time he does not want to bear the burden of a guilt which so sorely threatens his self-esteem. So he blames his parents. He accuses them of having pampered him, or having given him the wrong kind of education, or having been too strict with him, or having alienated him, misunderstood him, repressed him; whatever seems to fit the situation.

Again his assessment of THEIR hostility may be quite accurate. But even if it is, THEIR hostility is THEIR problem, not his in the present situation. His problem is his own hostility, and as long as he is using theirs to try to eliminate his sense of personal failure, there can only be detrimental effects.

He shifts what he feels is his responsibility onto them. Probably a further hostility against them. And the usual sequence ensues.

Once more visualize the same pattern of guilt, non-responsibility, and blame being enacted by the parents towards the boy, and you can build up what is a very commonplace picture of family alienation.

IV. Minimization of the hostile act. Trying to reduce the size and scope of a hostility or to make it not a hostility, has the same effect as other forms of justification. However consciously convincing it may be, the argument does not satisfy the unconscious sense of guilt. It simply produces conflict, tension, discomfort, and finally, where others are involved, the familiar cycle of blame and further hostility.

18. A father punishes his son for playing truant by cutting off his pocket money, and feels guilty for having done it. He tells himself that it is for the 'boy's own good'. And the logic and justice and apparent responsibility of his decision is quite unquestionable. It has no flaws - except that unconsciously he is simply not convinced. So that for reasons he cannot logically explain he still feels guilty.

However outwardly rational cutting off his son's pocket money in the circumstances might be, in his terms it is a hostile act. Unconscious agreements, as has been pointed out, are not always rational.

Discomfort, resentment, blame; and the down spiral of his relationship with his son has started.

19. A tells B something that destroys B's confidence in a particular venture, which B has planned and which A knew could be very successful.

A cannot help knowing precisely the effect he has created on B and the almost inevitable consequences of it, but he is not willing to take all of that upon

his conscience, so he attempts to reduce the size and significance of it. He says to himself; "Perhaps it wasn't a very fair thing to say, but he can't really take it seriously. After all I was half-joking. Surely he can't be STUPID enough to take it seriously." You can see already the direction his attitude is taking. B must be stupid, and so on.

A might even apologize to B, but with this attitude it is only half an apology. Already the deterioration has begun.

Any justification which is used to minimize, eliminate or pass responsibility for what a person feels is a hostility that he has committed, may be perfectly true and completely valid.

IT IS NOT THE TRUTH OR UNTRUTH OF A JUSTIFICATION THAT PRODUCES DETRIMENTAL EFFECTS, BUT THE USE TO WHICH IT IS PUT; I.E., TO COMBAT A SENSE OF GUILT, WHICH, THOUGH ITSELF CONSCIOUS, STEMS FROM A FIRMLY ENTRENCHED UNCONSCIOUS AGREEMENT THAT A HOSTILITY HAS BEEN COMMITTED.

- 21 True or false, justifications are no match for guilt. They simply intensify the discomfort which the guilt has already produced. Far from removing it, they perpetuate it, because they do nothing towards resolving it.
- 22 GUILT CAN ONLY BE RESOLVED BY A PERSON BECOMING COMPLETELY AWARE OF WHAT IT IS HE FEELS HE HAS DONE WRONG, COMMUNICATING IT WHEN AND WHERE APPROPRIATE, AND DOING WHATEVER CAN BE DONE TO RIGHT THE SITUATION - IN HIS TERMS.
- 23 This is responsibility, and responsibility is the only way through guilt. The question; 'Whose responsibility is a breakdown of contact between two people?' is irrelevant.
- 24 Responsibility is not an objective quantity, which IS in one place and is NOT in another. To say that so and so it responsible for such and such tells us nothing useful.
- 25 Responsibility is something that people feel, consciously and unconsciously, within themselves. A valid question is this; 'IN A BREAKDOWN OF CONTACT BETWEEN TWO PEOPLE, HOW MUCH OF THE RESPONSIBILITY WHICH HE FEELS FOR THE BREAKDOWN, IS EACH PERSON PREPARED TO RECOGNIZE, ACCEPT, AND ACT UPON ACCORDING TO HIS DEMANDS UPON HIMSELF?'
- 26 The criterion is comfort and discomfort, satisfaction and dissatisfaction, positive attitudes and feelings against negative attitudes and feelings. IF WE FEEL POSITIVE IN OUR TERMS, THEN WE MAY HAVE COMMITTED HOSTILITIES BUT WE ARE TRULY ACCEPTING THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THEM WHICH WE FEEL. IF WE FEEL NEGATIVE IN OUR TERMS, THEN WE ARE IN SOME WAY OR OTHER UNAWARENESS, IGNORANCE, JUSTIFICATION, BLAME, MINIMISATION REJECTING THE RESPONSIBILITIES, WHICH WE FEEL ARE OURS.
- 27 If we lived by that rule, we would stop destroying one another, mentally, spiritually and physically, both on a personal level and on a group and mass level.
- 28 If we lived by that rule, we would halt the cycle of blame and hostility which perpetuates itself in a dwindling spiral because of our refusal to see it; we would eliminate the conflict between individuals and between groups, because we would eliminate the conflict within ourselves.
- 29 If you are feeling bad, you can serve no constructive purpose by simply pointing out someone ELSE'S failures and hostilities - either to him or to a third party. Do this by all means if you want to do it. Express your

feelings and your attitudes. Recognize your instinct to blame, and given vent to it if you feel that it is the right thing to do. But at the same time recognize that:

- 30 THE ONLY THINGS THAT CAN MAKE YOU FEEL BAD ARE YOUR OWN FAILURES AND HOSTILITIES TOGETHER WITH A REFUSAL ON YOUR PART TO ACCEPT THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THEM WHICH YOU FEEL.
- 31 IF YOU ARE FEELING BAD AND YOU WISH TO DO SOMETHING CONSTRUCTIVE ABOUT IT, THEN LOOK FOR YOUR OWN FAILURES AND HOSTILITIES, NOT SOMEONE ELSE'S.
- 32 If someone ELSE is feeling bad, THEN there can be a constructive purpose in pointing out his hostilities to him - in order to help him, if he is willing to listen and accept the sense of responsibility which he is not rejecting. (In this case an even better way to get him to look at his hostilities is by relevant questioning rather than by simply telling him.)
- 33 But remember you need a sharp awareness to direct someone's attention to his hostilities. What you are looking for is not what he has done, which YOU would feel guilty about had you done it; that is compulsive identification; but what he has done or failed to do, which HE feels guilty about and for which he is unwilling to accept his guilt.
- 34 Now you may feel it is your duty to help a particular person to accept responsibility for his hostilities, and that it would be a hostility on your part not to do so. You may feel it is your duty to help many people to accept responsibility for their hostilities, and that it would be a hostility on your part not to do so.
- 35 Excellent. And where this is truly and genuinely so, it is quite possible for you to feel bad - not directly because of the hostilities of others, but because you feel that you have failed or are failing by allowing them to commit hostilities, or at least by not doing everything you can to prevent them from committing hostilities. In this case part of doing everything you can to right a situation which you feel responsible for having helped to make wrong, could be to help others to look at their hostilities.
- 36 BUT - learn to tell the difference between this perfectly valid and constructive attitude, and a need to blame and to express your blame in order to avoid looking at something which YOU have done or failed to do and for which you are unwilling to accept the responsibility that you feel.
- 37 You are your own judge in this matter. If you judge right, you will feel right. But if you allow yourself to deceive yourself, you can only suffer an even greater dissatisfaction.

As it is, so be it.

October 1969

ROBERT DE GRIMSTON

THIS MATERIAL IS THE PROPERTY OF THE PROCESS

Return to [Logics](#)

Return to [Process Teachings](#)